UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,004	03/31/2006	Hiroaki Minamide	8075-1017	1275
466 VOLNIC & TU	7590 12/20/2007		EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON 745 SOUTH 23RD STREET			BAKER, DAVID S	
2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON,	VA 22202		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
		2884		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	12/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			a		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/553,004	MINAMIDE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	-		
	David S. Baker	2884			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	dress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period value of the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron , cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. imely filed on the mailing date of this core (S5 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Se	eptember 2007.				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E			merits is		
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 15-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 15-19 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 11 October 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		-D 4 404/4)		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National	Stage		
Attachment(s)	_		·		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number:

10/553,004 Art Unit: 2884

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 17 September 2007 has been accepted and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usami (JP 2002-303574 A) in view of Minami (US 4,874,808 A).

Regarding claim 15, Usami discloses a terahertz wave generator with optical components arranged along the optical axis (F:1-4, P:0004-0013, P:0028-0053, P:0077-0090). Usami does not disclose expressly that any of these optical components are cycloolefin components. Minami discloses cycloolefin components for use in optical systems (C:16 L:62 thru C:17 L:47). At the time the invention was made, it would have

Application/Control Number:

10/553,004 Art Unit: 2884

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a cycloolefin optical component in a terahertz wave optical system. The motivation for doing so would have been that cycloolefin optical components have desirable dielectric properties with a low absorption and a low index of refraction.

Regarding claim 16, Usami discloses that the terahertz optical system comprises a visible light source disposed and visible light from the visible light source are superimposed on the optical axis of the terahertz waves (F:1-4, P:0004-0013, P:0028-0053, P:0077-0090).

4. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usami (JP 2002-303574 A), Minami (US 4,874,808 A), and further in view of Nuss (US 5,789,750 A).

Regarding claims 17-18, Usami and Minami disclose the claimed invention but doe not disclose expressly that the frequency band of the terahertz waves is between $100 \, \text{GHz} - 10 \, \text{THz}$. Nuss discloses a terahertz spectrometer that operates between $100 \, \text{GHz} - 20 \, \text{THz}$. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the range of terahertz waves of Nuss as the range for Usami and Minami. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve imaging diversity by providing for a wider range of frequencies to scan with.

5. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usami (JP 2002-303574 A) in view of Minami (US 4,874,808 A).

Regarding claim 19, Usami discloses a terahertz band wave processing apparatus comprising: a terahertz band wave generator for generating predetermined terahertz waves (F:1-4, P:0004-0013, P:0028-0053, P:0077-0090); a terahertz wave detector for

10/553,004

Art Unit: 2884

detecting the terahertz waves (F:1-4, P:0004-0013, P:0028-0053, P:0077-0090); a first light transmission regulator for defining a light transmission path between the terahertz wave generator and the terahertz wave detector and regulating the optical axis (F:1-4, P:0004-0013, P:0028-0053, P:0077-0090); a light semi-transmissive plate for transmitting terahertz waves on the optical axis between the first light transmission regulator and the terahertz wave detector and reflecting light incident at a predetermined incident angle (F:1-4, P:0004-0013, P:0028-0053, P:0077-0090); and a second light transmission regulator set on the optical axis between the light semi-transmissive plate and the terahertz wave detector, characterized in that predetermined visible light enters the light semi-transmissive plate as pilot light and is reflected by said light semitransmissive plate and the optical axis of said reflected visible light is superimposed on the optical axis of the terahertz waves and the optical axis of said terahertz waves can be visually recognized in a simulated manner by the visible light (F:1-4, P:0004-0013, P:0028-0053, P:0077-0090). Usami does not disclose expressly that a light semitransparent plate is made of cycloolefin. Minami discloses cycloolefin components for use in optical systems (C:16 L:62 thru C:17 L:47). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a cycloolefin optical component in a terahertz wave optical system. The motivation for doing so would have been that cycloolefin optical components have improved mechanical characteristics resulting in more durable components.

10/553,004 Art Unit: 2884

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 17 September 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's arguments that Minami provides no motivation for the combination with Usami, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant is correct in asserting that Minami does not specifically disclose that cycloolefin components are advantageous for use in terahertz imaging systems. However, Minami does disclose that cycloolefin has excellent mechanical characteristics; this alone would provide motivation for use in any optical system since improved durability is nearly always desired.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by the amendment to claim 19.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Application/Control Number:

10/553,004 Art Unit: 2884

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David S. Baker whose telephone number is (571) 272-6003. The examiner can normally be reached on MTWRF 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DSB

State of the second sec